<u>Duke Power</u> Annual Review of Base Rates for Fuel Costs

Docket No. 2003-3-E

Direct Testimony
A. R. Watts
Utilities Department

Public Service Commission of South Carolina

1		TESTIMONY OF A. R. WATTS
2		FOR
3 4		THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA
5		DOCKET NO 2002 2 E
6 7		DOCKET NO. 2003-3-E
8		IN RE: DUKE POWER
9 10		Annual Review of Base Rates for Fuel Costs
11		
12		
13	Q.	WOULD YOU PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS AND
14		OCCUPATION?
15	A.	A. R. Watts, 101 Executive Center Drive, Columbia, South Carolina. I am employed
16		by The Public Service Commission of South Carolina, Utilities Department, as Chief
17		of Electric.
18	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND
19		EXPERIENCE.
20	A.	I received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Electrical Engineering from the
21		University of South Carolina in Columbia in 1976. I was employed at that time by
22		this Commission as a Utilities Engineer in the Electric Department and was
23		promoted to Chief of the Electric Department in August 1981. I have been in my
24		current position since October 1999. I have testified before this Commission in
25		conjunction with fuel clause, complaint, territorial assignment, siting, and general
26		rate proceedings.
27	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS
28		PROCEEDING?
29	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to summarize Staff's findings as set forth in the
30		Utilities Department's portion of the Staff Report and provide a review of the
31		methodology used in determining the Company's avoided fuel costs exclusive of the
32		variable O&M component.
33		•

1

Ο.	WHAT SPECIFIC A	REAS	WERE ENCOMPASSED I	BY
----	-----------------	------	--------------------	----

^	ann i	W13714-C4	KINE LE		DOT AS NO
2.	$S \perp A$	KEE'S	- BCX A i	VHNA	TION?

- 3 A. The Utilities Department's examination of the Company's fuel operations consisted,
- 4 in part, of a review of the Company's monthly operating reports, review of the
- 5 currently approved Adjustment For Fuel Costs tariff, and review of the Company's
- 6 short-term projections of kilowatt-hour sales and fuel costs.

7 Q. DID STAFF EXAMINE THE COMPANY'S PLANT OPERATIONS FOR

8 THE PERIOD?

- 9 A. Yes, we reviewed the Company's operation of its generating facilities, including
- special attention to the nuclear plant operations, to determine if the Company made
- every reasonable effort to minimize fuel costs.
- 12 Q. HAVE YOU DETERMINED THAT ANY SITUATIONS WARRANT
- 13 DETERMINATION THAT THE COMPANY HAS ACTED
- 14 UNREASONABLY IN OPERATING ITS FACILITIES AND THEREBY
- 15 CAUSING ITS CUSTOMERS TO BE SUBJECT TO PAYING HIGHER
- 16 FUEL COSTS?
- 17 A. No, the Company's generating facilities operated very well during the period under
- review. The actual average nuclear system capacity factor was 95.73%, which
- included five refueling outages during the review period. Four of these refueling
- 20 outages set records for shortest outage times ever at the respective units. The major
- 21 fossil units averaged over 95% availability for the majority of the period under
- review as indicated on Utilities Department Exhibit No. 1.

23 Q. WOULD YOU BRIEFLY EXPLAIN THE REMAINING UTILITIES

24 **DEPARTMENT'S EXHIBITS?**

- 25 A. Yes. Exhibit No. 2 shows the Company's Major Plant Outages for the months of
- April 2002 through March 2003, listing the plants by unit, duration of the outage,
- 27 reason for the outage, and corrective action taken. Exhibit No. 3 lists the Company's
- percentage Generation Mix by fossil, nuclear, and hydro for the period April 2002
- 29 through March 2003. Exhibit No. 4 reflects the Company's major plants by
- and name, type of fuel used, average fuel cost in cents per KWH to operate, and total

1		megawatt-hours generated for the twelve months ending March 2003. Exhibit
2		No. 5 shows a comparison of the Company's original retail megawatt-hour estimated
3		sales to the actual sales for the period under review. Exhibit No. 6 is a comparison of
4		the original fuel factor projections to the factors actually experienced for the twelve
5		months ending March 2003. Exhibit No. 7 is a graphical representation of the
6		data in Exhibit No. 6. Exhibit No. 8 is the Company's currently approved retail
7		Adjustment For Fuel Costs tariff. Exhibit No. 9 is a history of the cumulative
8		recovery account. Exhibit No. 10 is a table of estimates for the cumulative recovery
9		account balance for various base level fuel factors for the period ending May
10		2004.
11	Q.	WOULD YOU PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR REVIEW OF THE
12		METHODOLOGY USED IN DETERMINING THE COMPANY'S AVOIDED
13		FUEL COSTS?
14	A.	The Company's generation is categorized by four major groups including 1) base
15		load, 2) other fossil, 3) combustion turbines and 4) pumped storage. The data for
16		each generating facility includes megawatt-hours, production costs, and fuel and
17		emissions costs. A monthly percentage of the fuel and emission costs divided by
18		production plus emission costs was calculated using all the plant data from the non-
19		base load units. Emission costs are recorded separately from production costs and
20		the base load generation was excluded due to the remote possibility of these units
21		being displaced. This is an effective method for removing the non-fuel portion of

25 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

component was identified.

26 A. Yes, it does.

22

23

24

the Company's avoided production costs. The Audit Staff used the resulting monthly

percentages in determining allowable fuel costs for power purchases where no fuel